

and ascertain what is indigenous to our program that is not working? And, if the program does not work properly, if the return to the taxpayer is not there, if the benefit to the beneficiaries, the people who were expected to gain something from this \$1 billion, if it is not working, then they need to do something different. They need to look at the money and the resources and the way they are spent.

So I think that this is going to be yet another opportunity for government bureaucrats, for agency heads, to look inward within themselves, to have the optimism that they can be in control of their own future, to provide services, which is what this government is all about, to people who do need those outreaches of government, and to do the right thing.

So I am very excited about the opportunity to challenge government. Instead of just throwing more money at them every year and more and more and more, we are now going to challenge them in a way and say we know you can find the 1 percent. We have talked about these savings all across government tonight. They exist in every single agency, and I think it is going to be a wonderful day for every single government administrator and the heads of these agencies to know that with the challenge, that they can accept it and excel, because of the mission that we have of not spending the future retirement of each and every American today, but rather to keep it into a fund that is ready for them in the future, is what will help and benefit all Americans.

I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to be with you tonight. I know the people of Pennsylvania are well served. You have enthusiasm and integrity, coupled with the background and experience, and I want to thank you for allowing me to be here.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. We thank the gentleman from Texas.

Tonight we have heard about tugboats that cost \$875,000 apiece that were lost; a surface-to-air missile launcher that cost \$1 million that was lost; 5 aircraft engines, including two that cost \$4 million that were lost; a floating crane worth \$500,000 that was lost. We heard about Medicare spending \$20 billion annually, or paying \$20 billion annually for fraudulent payments, or what they believe to be fraudulent payments.

You know, it is kind of hard to think that you could not save a penny when you look at all those examples. We have one here of a nice courthouse in Brooklyn, New York, that cost \$152 million. The New York Attorney General's office has arrested 16 individuals suspected of kickback and bribery schemes in the construction of this courthouse, that is from the Citizens Against Government Waste, and \$4.3 million used to tear down 19 naval radio towers. Again, that is another one pointed out by Citizens Against Government Waste. It seems pretty in-

credible to think that you just cannot save a penny, a little more than a penny, out of every dollar.

Now, my experience in state government, this was sort of a routine thing. We often passed budgets that cut general government 2 to 3 percent, and what that was is we said department managers, you have to cut the fat out of your general government line item. You cannot go out there and cut the hand that serves the people, because the same 2 percent, to save 2 percent or 3 percent, you do not need to do that.

If state governments can cut 2 to 3 percent of savings out of general government, Mr. President, you can too. Instead of talking about new programs, let us talk about managing the ones you have.

I vividly remember the gentleman who served us so well as Attorney General, Richard Thornburg, who was Governor of Pennsylvania and who was a real good fiscal manager. I served the whole time he was Governor of Pennsylvania in the state legislature.

He was a tough fiscal manager. Every department was asked to become more efficient. Every bureau was asked to reorganize and provide their services, do away with unneeded paperwork and become more efficient.

The state historically had, I am going on memory here, but think I am accurate, about 103,000 employees historically. When he left office after 8 years of governing I believe they had 88,000 or 89,000 employees.

I had a district office in my district, and I want to tell you, the service improved, because not only did we have less employees, paperwork and waste and redundant things were done away with, departments were asked and forced to manage themselves, bureaus were asked to provide the services more cost effectively, and they did.

Government can become more efficient if it has leadership to take it there. Now, I think we have just begun maybe a new cycle. I think this is something we ought to be looking at with some routine. Mr. President, this year trim another percentage out of general government. That is not where people are served; that is where bureaucrats are served.

In my view, this is a very appropriate way to look for savings that could, as happened in Pennsylvania, improve the quality of government, improve the services, because they are managed better.

Mr. President, it is time to manage each and every department a little bit better. It is time to look for waste and incompetency and root it out. It is time to reorganize the structure of government so it can be more efficient and better serve the needs of the people.

Let us save a penny out of every dollar by finding the waste, the fraud and the abuse, and make sure that we never again balance the budget by using Social Security; that we look to live within our needs; that we save a penny

or two pennies, whatever it takes, whenever it is, and pay down the debt.

It is time for the American taxpayers to be assured that their Federal Government is going to live within its means, it is never going to look to the Social Security trust fund again to be used for general government purposes, and we are going to concentrate on making the programs we have work better, or do away with them.

We have had a hard time doing that. But the President should be leading us. His administrators know as well as anyone that there are programs that have lost their usefulness, and it seems ironic that Congress and the President in the past have had a hard time, because times change, priorities change, needs change, and the needs of 1984 may not have a whole lot to do with it. But the programs that were started in 1984 are still running. It is time to squeeze that penny until we have our fingerprint in it, that we save that penny and a little bit more out of every dollar of the taxpayers' money, and that we, once and for all, balance the budget, make Social Security safe and just make government more efficient.

POLITICAL HYPOCRISY ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to know that my Republican colleagues who spoke before me this evening basically showed, if you will, their hypocrisy on the Social Security issue.

The bottom line is we all know that Republicans have always disliked Social Security, and now they are trying to have the American people believe they are suddenly the steadfast defenders of the Social Security program by essentially distorting their record on the issue of Social Security.

Let there be no question about it: The Republicans have already spent at least \$13 billion of the Social Security surplus. They are trying to give you the impression that somehow that is not the case, that they are going to balance the budget without using the Social Security surplus. The reality is they have already spent at least \$13 billion of it with the appropriations bills that have already passed the House of Representatives.

TOM DELAY, the Republican Whip, said at one time, this was October 1st in the Washington Times, "I will not vote for any bill that spends any of the Social Security surplus." But his own Congressional Budget Office has repeatedly said, and we have said it over and over again, we need to say it as Democrats because of what the Republicans are trying to do to distort the record, TOM DELAY's own Congressional

Budget Office has repeatedly said that Republicans have already spent \$13 billion of the Social Security surplus on the Republican spending bills, on the appropriations bills.

According to the CBO, their own Congressional Budget Office, Republicans are on their way to spending \$24 billion of the Social Security surplus with the bills that they keep cranking out and sending to the President. I think the ultimate irony of it all is when the President vetoes these bills and basically sends them back, which means the money is not spent, they criticize the President and say he wants to spend the Social Security surplus.

Well, how can he do that if he vetoes the bill? The bills that they send to him are the spending bills. When he takes his pen and crosses it out and says I will not spend that money and he sends it back, the money is not spent. So it is the President in vetoing these bills and saying look, I want to look at this entire budget. You show me how you are going to put together these 13 appropriation bills and what that is going to add up to in the end, because he is concerned that he does not want to spend any of the Social Security surplus, and in fact it is the Republicans by passing these spending bills and sending them to him that are in fact doing just that.

Let me go beyond the immediate question of the issue of spending Social Security surplus, because I do not think there is any doubt that the Republican leadership has already done that. But they have always opposed the concept of Social Security. The members of this Republican leadership have repeatedly been on record as saying that they are opposed to or wanted to phase out or somehow suggest they do not like Social Security as a concept, as a system.

The fact is that DICK ARMEY, TOM DELAY and the rest of the Republican leadership have a long track record, from either indifference to outright hostility, toward Social Security.

Republicans wanted to eliminate guaranteed benefits for Social Security through various privatization schemes. We have not heard about that, but many, many in the Republican leadership have talked about the need to privatize Social Security, which, in my opinion, is the same thing as not having the system as a guaranteed government system. They have no plan to extend the life of the Social Security trust fund. They basically want to let it wither on the vine.

We all know that if something is not done soon, at some point into the next 10 or 20 years the Social Security trust fund is going to start to run out of money. And where is their plan? Where is the Republican plan to extend the life of that program? The only person who has put forward a plan, or I should say the only prominent person who has put forward a plan to try to shore up Social Security over the long term, is the President of the United States, Bill

Clinton, who they basically distort what he says every night here.

Once again, over the weekend he put forward and said that he wanted his long-term plan to shore up Social Security to be part of this budget agreement that he wants to work on with the Republicans, with the Congress, over the next few weeks. They just ignore that. They ignore the fact that Social Security needs to be fixed on a long term basis.

You know, the amazing thing is the President's plan, if it were adopted, would basically extend the life of the Social Security trust fund by 15 years. The Republicans do not extend the life of that fund a single day.

The other thing that I wanted to point out is very conveniently my colleagues on the other side forgot what they did for the last 6 months when they put together this \$1 trillion tax cut bill that primarily benefited the wealthy Americans and the corporations and would have just obliterated any effort to try to provide the surplus for Social Security. In fact, the Republican tax plan, which the President wisely vetoed, would have sucked the surplus dry, leaving nothing for strengthening the Social Security trust fund or extending the life of the Medicare Trust Fund or modernizing Medicare with prescription drug coverage.

When I go out and talk to my seniors, they are worried about the long-term impact, whether or not Social Security is going to be there. They are worried about whether Medicare is going to be there. They want to make sure that Medicare includes the prescription drug fund.

If this Republican tax plan, passed by the Republicans in both houses with few if any Democratic votes, had not been vetoed by President Clinton, there would not be anything to discuss here, because any effort to modernize Medicare, provide for prescription drugs, to make sure that we could shore up and save Social Security over the next 30 years, all that would have been out the window. They spent 6 months on that, and finally the President vetoed it. But they have forgotten. We do not hear about that anymore, because obviously it did not work and they are not getting any mileage out of it, so they do not talk about it anymore. Republicans voted for \$1 trillion for tax cuts for the wealthy and the corporate special interests. Not one penny of that for Social Security.

Let me just talk a little bit, because over the weekend the president reiterated once again the need to look at Social Security over the long term, to shore it up for the future.

□ 1915

He is the one that is out there talking about this. Basically what the President is saying is that any surplus that is generated, I am not talking about the Social Security Trust Fund and the surplus that is in there, but I

am talking about the general revenue, the money that comes from one's income taxes and other fees that one pays the Federal Government, the general revenue surplus, which, because of the Balanced Budget Act, is going to continue to grow over the next 10 years, he is saying that that surplus, if any, because we are not sure if there is going to be any, but if there is some, he wants to take that general revenue money, that income tax money, and he wants to apply that or a good percentage of that to Social Security so that we have enough money over the long-term.

Because my colleagues have to understand that, under the current system, if we continue the way we do, there will not be enough money for Social Security in another 20 or 30 years.

Well, the President basically said in his weekly radio address over the weekend that he would send Congress legislation next week based on a proposal he first floated earlier this year, this is almost a year ago in the State of the Union address, to shore up Social Security with projected Federal budget surpluses.

I quote, "The American people deserve more than confusion, double-talk, and delay on this issue", Mr. Clinton said. "It is time to have a clear straightforward bill on the table; and next week, I plan to present one, legislation that ensures that all Social Security payroll tax will go to savings and debt reduction for Social Security."

Now, what could be more clear. Here is the Democratic President who, in a long series of Democratic Presidents going back now to Franklin Roosevelt, is saying it is very important for us to look at Social Security over the long-term. My Republican colleagues do not even deal with the issue at all. It is not on the radar screen.

The White House said over the weekend that its plan would extend Social Security solvency from 2034 when, under current projections, it would be able to pay only 75 percent of promised benefits, to the year 2050, beyond the life-span of most of the 76 million Americans born in the 18 years after World War II.

So what the President is saying is that, at some point, I guess it is about 30 years from now, we will not have enough money in this trust fund to pay but 75 percent of the Social Security benefits. So we have to do something. He is putting forth the plan that says what we can do to extend the trust fund to at least the year 2050.

That may seem like a long time away, but for young people who are born now or who are in their twenties, that is when they will be reaching retirement age.

Here, again, is a quote from Gene Sperling, who is the director of the White House's National Economic Council. He says, "What we have tried to do is present what we feel is the most solid bipartisan, hopefully non-controversial proposal to lock away

the Social Security surplus for debt reduction and use those interest savings to extend the solvency of Social Security."

Now, let me explain that a little more. What the President's proposal basically does is to pay down the debt so that the money is available for Social Security. The President has been talking for some time about the need to reduce the national debt and basically saying that, if we save money, and we do not spend money, we will be able to apply that to the national debt.

The Clinton plan, again I am reading from the New York Times, this is Sunday, October 24, "Mr. Clinton's plan is based on the idea that, by using the Social Security surplus to pay down the national debt, the government's interest bill will decline substantially. By the White House estimate, the government's interest expense will be \$107 billion lower in 2011 than it would be if the Social Security surplus were not used starting this year to reduce the debt.

"Mr. Clinton's proposal would take the money saved, because of the lower amount of debt starting in 2011, and earmark it to shore up Social Security. From the years 2011 through 2015, the total savings and interest dedicated to Social Security would be \$544 billion," Mr. Sperling said.

"And savings would continue accruing beyond 2015 at around \$189 billion a year. The savings would at first go to further reductions in the national debt.

"After the debt was paid off, around 2015, under the White House's scenario, this savings would continue to be transferred to the Social Security in the form of a government IOU that would later be redeemed to pay benefits."

The point of the matter is the beauty part of the President's proposal is that we are actually paying down the national debt, something that the Republicans claim they care about, but I do not see any action on it here. I do not see any efforts here to talk about the national debt. That is what the President is proposing to do. That is what his Social Security proposal would do, deal with this problem on a long-term basis.

Instead, the Republicans, what do they do, they do not talk about the long-term needs of the Social Security program. They just keep spending and spending so that now the appropriations bills actually dip into the trust fund and use the Social Security Trust Fund again to finance regular operating funds for the next fiscal year.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about this tax cut again that the Republican leadership and my colleagues on the other side sort of conveniently ignored in the last few days, in the last few weeks as we are talking about this budget. President Clinton vetoed this trillion dollar tax cut, which primarily benefited the wealthy corporations, for one simple reason; and that is, it wastes the surplus on special interest tax cuts instead of investing in the future of all Americans.

What the President is trying to say is that, if we give back this huge tax cut primarily to the wealthy and to the corporations, what are we doing for the future of the country? Nothing.

On the other hand, if we take his Social Security proposal and basically pay down the national debt, we are investing in the future. That is the point. What do we want to do? Do we want to give a quick giveaway to a few people, a few corporations, a few special interests, or do we want to invest money in the future so the money is there for Social Security in the future and so that, basically, the economy prospers.

The Republican tax plan basically meant \$46,000 per year for the wealthiest taxpayers, but only \$160 per year for the average middle class people. Republicans lavish nearly \$21 billion on special interest tax breaks for big business. Let us not forget how much of that was just tax breaks for big corporations.

The Republican tax plan eats the surplus hold, preventing us from paying down a significant chunk of the \$5.6 trillion national debt. Debt reduction, of course, is the best way to ensure that we continue our record economic expansion by keeping interest rates low. This was the President's economic plan, something that the GOP has basically rejected.

The Republican plan also siphoned money away from other critical areas, especially for strengthening Medicare and for providing prescription drug plans to help seniors pay for the costs of life-saving medication.

Let me talk about that briefly again, because then we do not hear anything about the long-term plans that the Republicans have for Medicare, unless they want that to also wither on the vine like Social Security.

Again, this week, I think it was Monday, the President at the White House had a press conference, talked about the need to push for a prescription drug benefit in the context of Medicare. His long-term proposal which was going to shore up Social Security also provided for revamping Medicare to provide for a prescription drug plan.

This is very important to senior citizens. When I talked to the seniors in my district and even the people who are younger who know that eventually they are going to be senior citizens, they worry about how they are going to pay for prescription drugs. Most seniors do not have a prescription drug plan, or, if they do have a plan, they have huge co-payments. It does not pay for a lot of their expenses. We find a lot of seniors that just go without prescription drugs or take half of a prescription when it is prescribed by the doctor.

What the President has basically said is that he wants to establish a new Part D benefit, very similar to Medicare Part B, where one pays a certain amount per month, and one gets half of all the costs of all of one's prescription drugs paid for.

There may be a lot of different ways to pay for prescription drugs and pro-

vide a benefit under Medicare for it, but at least he is trying. He is talking about this. He has folded this into his long-term economic plan that includes shoring up Social Security.

I do not hear anybody on the other side talking about it. I do not hear anybody on the other side suggesting that somehow they are going to deal with this problem on a long-term basis.

So, again, it is the Democratic President, it is the Democratic Party that are talking about these issues that will in the long term benefit the average senior citizen. All we see on the other side is a Republican effort to spend money and take it out of Social Security.

There is no question that there is a GOP strategy here that is a subterfuge and that is an effort to try to mask what is really going on.

In an enlightened moment back in August, this is on Friday, August 6, in the New York Times, the Republican Whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), who is basically running the show around here from what I can see, basically exposed what his real strategy was with spending the Social Security surplus. Basically what it is to force the President to his knees, that is actually a quote, and spend the Social Security surplus. That is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is all about.

He admitted publicly that he is misleading the public with his spend-and-deceive budget strategy. That is what we are hearing is this deceitful strategy that is being played up here on the House floor day after day the last few days, the last week.

What the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) basically confessed was that the Republican promise to join the Democrats in saving the budget surplus for Social Security was a blatant lie. He recounted in detail the Republican strategy.

If I could, I will just go through this from the New York Times. "'The plan', Mr. DELAY said, 'was for Republicans to drain the surplus out of next year's budget and force the President to pay for my additional spending requests out of the Social Security surplus,' which both parties have pledged to protect.

"'We are going to spend it and then some. From the get-go, the strategy has always been we are going to spend what is left', admitted Republican Whip TOM DELAY.

"'The Republican strategy', Mr. DELAY said, 'will also force the President to sign the Republican parties spending bills for next year.'"

He has not agreed to do so. He has been vetoing them. But they want him to sign because they want to spend the money and spend the Social Security surplus.

Again, I go back to the New York Times from August 6: "He", the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) "said that even if the spending swallowed up the budget surplus, the Republicans

had a plan to use various budgetary mechanisms that would allow them to say they had stuck to the strict spending caps they imposed in 1997, the Balanced Budget Act. We will negotiate with the President after he vetoes the bills on his 'knees', Mr. DELAY said."

Well, I am going to go into some of those gimmicks that the Republicans are using, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is using to try to mask what they are really doing here by spending the Social Security surplus. But before I get into that, I wanted to give my colleagues some quotes from these Republican leaders where they talked about their long-term plans to get rid of Social Security.

This is in 1984 when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the Majority Leader, in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, October 21, 1984, said that "Social Security was a bad retirement and a rotten trick on the American people." He continues, "I think we are going to have to bite the bullet on Social Security and phase it out over a period of time." That was the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the Majority Leader, in 1984.

This is from CNN's Crossfire on September 27 of 1994, Michael Kinsley asked the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. ARMEY) the question: "Are you going to take the pledge? Are you going to promise not to cut people's Social Security to meet these promises?" The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) said, "No, I am not going to make such a promise."

Lastly, this was in the same year, September 28 of 1994, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) said on a C-SPAN call show, "I would never have created Social Security."

So do not believe these guys when they say that they are trying to make sure they do not spend the Social Security surplus. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) have a long history of not being in favor of Social Security. That is what we are seeing. That is what ultimately will manifest itself here, because they do not have a long-term plan to deal with it other than to get rid of it.

I talked a little bit before about these creative gimmicks that are being used by the Republican leadership to try to mask that they are really spending the Social Security surplus. I do not want to spend a lot of time on them, but I do want to talk a little bit about them this evening if I could.

It is difficult when I talk to my constituents about these creative accounting gimmicks, because it sounds like a lot of bureaucracy and is very hard to explain the technicalities of what they are trying to do. But there are many ways creatively in this Congress that one can really mask what one is doing with the budget and how one is spending money and where it is coming from. We would have to probably spend hours to explain all the details about how they do it.

But there was a very good article, if I could mention it this evening, Madam Speaker, on Saturday, October 16 in the Washington Post by Eric Pianan and George Hager where they talked about Congress making greater use of creative accounting. I think they kind of distilled some of these gimmicks and put them in some common-sense terms. So I just wanted to take a few minutes if I could to highlight some of those gimmicks in this article by these two gentlemen that was in the Washington Post again on Saturday, October 16.

□ 1930

They say the Nation's defense contractors will have to wait an extra week to get paid this year. Routine maintenance of Pentagon facilities will be considered emergency spending. To keep from cutting education and health programs, lawmakers plan to borrow \$15 billion from next year's budget.

So one of the ways that we can mask what we are doing with the budget is by declaring items emergency spending. We can say, oh, it is emergency spending so it does not count. That may sound crazy to my constituents and to the American public, but it is a fact. And what the Republicans have done is to declare a lot of things emergencies that really are not.

The best example probably, as has been mentioned several times on the floor of the House of Representatives, is when they decided to declare the funding for the census that occurs every 10 years as an emergency. Well, how can something that is required by the Constitution, the Constitution says every 10 years we have to do a census, how can that be an emergency when we know 10 years in advance that we have to do it? Well, that is an example.

I will go back to this article from the Washington Post. It says, "As a Republican controlled Congress struggles to complete work on the budget, it is relying to an unprecedented degree on creative accounting to boost spending beyond what its rules allow. All told, congressional budgeteers have manufactured an additional \$46 billion to spend this year on defense, farms, education and other programs. The situation underscores the immense difficulty of writing budget discipline into law and how easy it is for Congress and the President to circumvent what are supposed to be ironclad limits designed to keep spending in check. Under the 1997 balanced budget agreement, the Federal Government was supposed to spend only \$592 billion in the 13 bills funding government's daily operations this year. But Congress is on target to spend roughly \$640 billion."

So the problem that the Republican leadership faces is that under the Balanced Budget Act, which we all adopted a couple of years ago, the spending for this year is supposed to be only \$592 billion. In reality, they are spending about \$640 billion, if we look at their

budget. Well, we can see the discrepancies there and why it is necessary to come up with these accounting gimmicks.

Again, I am reading from this Washington Post article. "Independent budget experts on the right and the left say Congress is masking the true size of its spending binge and could create serious budget problems when the obligations for the delayed spending come due. The actions also call into question whether the government will realize soaring surplus projections, which depend heavily on Congress ratcheting down on spending."

So if we delay the spending and essentially go into next year's budget, ultimately this will come home to roost and we will have a bigger problem next year. What of course we do is, we do not have the surplus and we will not be able to generate the surplus that supposedly is going to be generated by this Balanced Budget Act we passed 2 years ago if we keep spending into it. That is exactly what they are doing, spending into the Social Security surplus to pay for these ongoing programs that they claim are not really being spent as part of the surplus. In reality, that is what they are doing.

Going back to The Washington Post article again. "To the extent this approach is effective, it creates a bigger hole that has to be filled the following year, said The Brookings Institution's Robert Reischauer, a former director of the Congressional Budget Office." And it is very shortsighted, is what he says. Obviously, it is shortsighted to keep delaying spending into next year.

Just an idea of how they go about these sort of advanced appropriations. In recent years, and this is back to The Washington Post, for instance, "Congress and the administration has balanced out their numbers by borrowing funds from future appropriations. Last year, Congress agreed to \$11.6 billion of such advanced appropriations. This year congressional Republicans plan to borrow twice that amount, including funds for education, job training programs, and rental housing subsidies. That will make it even more difficult to keep spending down when they consider the same programs a year from now.

"With the approval of an \$8.7 billion farm bill out this week," which was the week of October 16, "Congress has declared a total of \$22 billion in spending emergencies that also do not count against the budget limitations. Other such emergencies include spending for the 2000 census, fuel assistance for the poor, and maintenance of Pentagon barracks and facilities." Again, these are these declared emergencies which basically make it so that we do not have to count it but the money is really spent.

Finally, the article concludes that, "Even with this more aggressive use of budget tactics, the Congressional

Budget Office has estimated that lawmakers would still tap the Social Security surplus by anywhere from \$13 billion to \$20 billion. Republicans may have to resort to an across-the-board spending cut of 1 to 2 percent to keep from doing that."

Now, let me get into that, if I could a little bit, Madam Speaker, because that is basically what we were hearing from the other side of the aisle tonight. They know they have spent this \$13 to \$20 billion of the Social Security surplus. They will not admit it, but it is a fact. It is in the Congressional Budget Office analysis. Everyone knows it. So now they are talking about this 1 percent. I think it was 1.4 percent, but now they are talking 1 percent, so I guess they revised it, that they are trying to say they are going to implement as a way of getting around spending the Social Security surplus.

Well, this is really just an admission of the fact that they have been caught red-handed dipping into the Social Security surplus. They are looking scrambling around to make up the difference with gimmicks and these across-the-board spending cuts. This plan to require a 1 percent automatic budget cut, if the Office of Management and Budget certifies that spending would dip into Social Security, is really an admission by the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), that Republicans have stuck their hands deep into the Social Security cookie jar. It is basically asking the Administration to save House Republicans from themselves.

One of the other things that they did, which I thought was particularly interesting, was this idea to raid the tax refunds of the working poor. Every day we get a different gimmick. It is either emergencies, delayed spending, 1 percent across-the-board, and the one a couple of weeks ago was this idea of taking the earned income tax from the working poor and using that. Actually, their proposal would have delayed \$7 billion worth of earned income tax payments to the working poor in order to fill the gaps in the budget.

I do not know what they were thinking with that. Maybe that somehow the working poor, because they figured they do not have time to vote or do not have time to read the newspaper or something, that they were not going to notice that they did not receive their tax refund up front. I do not even know if they have dropped that. That may still be out there as another way or another gimmick of trying to somehow hoodwink the American people as to what they are really up to.

Let me just say, though, because I have heard this 1 percent plan mentioned several times this evening by my Republican colleagues who spoke before me, that even that does not add up. They are pretending a 1 percent across-the-board cut will do the trick and erase their \$12 or \$13 billion spending where they have dipped into the

Social Security surplus. But even with that, they are still nearly \$4 billion in the hole based on their own phony accounting. In reality, I say they are way on their way of dipping into even more and more of the Social Security surplus.

As we see what develops over the next few days or the next few weeks here, I am sure we will all find that, in fact, they are spending even more, and they are going to go way beyond that \$12 or \$13 billion that has already been spent from the Social Security surplus and even spend more before they finally wrap up this budget process.

Madam Speaker, I do not intend to spend a lot more time this evening, but I feel it is my obligation and that of my colleagues on the Democratic side to come here every night and basically present the truth and expose this GOP hypocrisy on Social Security. I have never seen an effort by my Republican colleagues to basically come to the floor every night and somehow think that if they are going to keep saying this over and over again, that the President is dipping into Social Security or the Democrats want to dip into Social Security, that somehow it is going to be believed.

They are even running these ads, very expensive ads, I should say, in a lot of the districts of my Democratic colleagues, accusing my Democratic colleagues of dipping into Social Security. I think the theory is if they tell the lie often enough that people will believe it; or if they spend enough money getting the message out, even though it is not true, people will believe it. I hope the people do not believe it. And certainly we will continue on this side of the aisle to expose the truth about what is really going on here and how much money is already being spent by the Republicans with their spending bills.

The ultimate irony is that they keep coming and talking about how the President wants to keep spending money. Well, the President does not appropriate the funds. They are in the majority. The Republicans are in the majority in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate. They are in the majority. They send him the bills. If he vetoes the bills, the money is not spent. That is the constitutional process.

So for the life of me I do not understand how any of them can suggest that by the President vetoing a bill that somehow he is spending the Social Security surplus, when all he is saying is that the money cannot be spent. If he vetoes the bill, the money is not spent. The only way the money is spent is if they appropriate the money and he signs the bill.

So the whole process, the whole way they go about describing the process, is basically not true. And I think it is incumbent upon myself and others to come here every night and to explain what is really going on here in this Republican effort and their inability to

adopt a budget that does anything but spend the Social Security surplus.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE YOUTH OF OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor of the House again on a Tuesday night to talk about an issue that I talk about as often as possible, and that is the problem that we have in our country and also in dealing in Congress with the issue of illegal narcotics and the tremendous impact that illegal narcotics are having on our young people.

Tonight I am going to focus a little bit on some of the issues that relate to the question of the District of Columbia's appropriation and some specific measures that are in the appropriations bill that deal with the District of Columbia.

I also intend to talk a bit about the general war on drugs and review a little bit how we got ourselves into that situation.

Time permitting, Madam Speaker, I also hope to talk some about Colombia and the administration's potential request, which certainly will dramatically affect our spending as soon as we finish with the problems we have now in funding the fiscal year 1999-2000 requirements. We are expecting a rather substantial request to come in by the administration, and we will talk about that and Colombia and how we got ourselves into that particular dilemma.

And I will also talk a bit about the situation in Panama, that whole region that has been such an active area as far as illegal narcotics trafficking and disruption in general for the entire hemisphere.

So those are a few subjects, and then, time permitting, I will get into some of the updates that I usually try to do on problems relating to illegal narcotics and how they affect all our communities across the land.

The first thing that I want to talk about tonight is something that I hear repeatedly over and over; that the war on drugs has failed; that, indeed, we have lost the war on drugs. I have some very good friends, even on the conservative side, and I noticed one of the columnists, who is very conservative in his opinion, this past week came out and said why not legalize narcotics; that the war on drugs is a failure. I always try to relate my topic of discussion to the facts and deal with the facts and statistics, information that we have had presented to us in the subcommittee which I chair, which is the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform.

We have had many, many hearings since I have taken that subcommittee